

Attorney Docket No.: 944-1.43
Serial No.: 09/777,520

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-18 and rejected same. With this paper, the claims are unchanged.

Obviousness-type double patenting

At paragraph 3 of the Office action, claims 1-18 are rejected for non-statutory double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,678,510.

The question of whether U.S. Pat. No. 6,678,510 is grounds for doubling patenting aside, applicant respectfully notes that U.S. Pat. No. 6,678,510 is not prior art, since it has the same filing date as the application (5 Feb. 2001).

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1-18 under non-statutory double patenting be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.

9 March 2004

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Retter

Registration No. 41,266